

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

GEORGE C. PAPPAS,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN
POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:13-cv-00607-APG-NJK

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO
RECUSE AND FOR
RECONSIDERATION

(Docket Nos. 39, 40)

Pending before the Court are two motions filed by Plaintiff. First, Plaintiff has filed a motion for the undersigned to recuse herself from this case. *See* Docket No. 40. Plaintiff argues that recusal is warranted because the undersigned vacated the hearing on his attorney's motion to withdraw and granted the motion upon a showing of good cause. *Id.* at 2. A party's disagreement with the Court's rulings is not a sufficient basis for recusal. *See United States v. Chischilly*, 30 F.3d 1144, 1149-50 (9th Cir. 1994); *see also Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) ("judicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis for a bias or partiality motion"). "[O]pinions formed by the judge on the basis of facts introduced or events occurring in the course of the current proceedings, or of prior proceedings, do not constitute a basis for a bias or partiality motion unless they display a deep-seated favoritism or antagonism that would make fair judgment impossible." *Liteky*, 510 U.S. at 555. Here, the Court found good cause for the withdrawal of counsel, and also determined in its discretion that a hearing was not required. *See* Docket No. 26. The Court discerns nothing in that order requiring recusal. Accordingly, the motion to recuse is hereby DENIED.

1 Plaintiff also filed a motion to reconsider the Court's order at Docket No. 26 granting the
2 motion to withdraw and vacating the hearing on that motion. *See* Docket No. 39. This is the second
3 motion to reconsider that order. *See* Docket No. 29. The pending motion to reconsider does not
4 provide sufficient grounds to reconsider the prior order, *see, e.g., Kabo Tools Co. v. Porauto Indus.*
5 *Co., Ltd.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 156928, *6 (D. Nev. Oct. 31, 2013) (outlining standards for motions
6 for reconsideration), and for the reasons already stated, the Court finds that its prior order was
7 correct. Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is hereby DENIED.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: December 23, 2013

10
11 
12 _____
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28